

1
2 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
3 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

4 ANDREW LINDSTROM,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 NEVADA STATE MILITIA (NEVADA
8 NATIONAL GUARD),

9 Defendant.

Case No. 3:24-cv-00152-ART-CSD

ORDER

Re: ECF No. 38

10
11 Before the court is Plaintiff's document entitled "Amendment to Complaint" (ECF No.
12 38). Defendant filed a response (ECF No. 39).

13 Plaintiff's "Amendment to Complaint" document is considered to be a fugitive document
14 because it is not an amended complaint. The document fails to set forth a short and plain statement
15 of the grounds for jurisdiction, a short and plain statement showing Plaintiff is entitled to relief,
16 and a demand for the relief sought. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1)-(3). Nor does the document
17 constitute a motion for leave to amend the complaint (with proposed amended complaint attached).
18 *See* LR 15-1.

19
20 The court has inherent authority to strike fugitive documents from the record. *See Mazzeo*
21 *v. Gibbons*, No. 2:08-cv-01387-RLH-PAL, 2010 WL 3910072, at *3 (D. Nev. Sept. 30, 2010).

22 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Amendment to Complaint (ECF No. 38) shall
23 be **STRICKEN**.

24
25 DATED: December 6, 2024.

26
27 
28 Craig S. Denney
United States Magistrate Judge